

REMARKS

Claims 8-21 and 28-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 8 and 16 have been amended. Claims 8 and 16 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 and Claims Dependent Thereon

Lyon/Stephens Rejection:

Claims 8-10, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0145342 to Lyon (hereafter “Lyon”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,254 to Stephens (hereafter “Stephens”). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

In the Amendment filed October 24, 2006, Applicants previously argued that neither Lyon nor Stephens, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a coil configured to alternate between an energized and de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode. However, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner asserts,

“Since no polling mode circuitry is claimed, any coil is configured to energize and de-energize at a regular interval in a polling mode, e.g., any coil can transmit FM, AM and etc.” (Office Action at page 11).

However, Applicants have amended claim 8 to more clearly recite that the processor unit *is programmed to operate in a polling mode*, and that the coil *is controlled by the processor unit* to alternate between the energized and de-energized state at regular intervals while in the polling mode. Applicants respectfully submit that this distinguishes over the Examiner’s characterization of “any coil” in the Response to Arguments. Applicants further submit that neither Lyon nor

Stephens teaches or suggests a coil that is actually controlled to alternate between energized and de-energized states at regular intervals, during a polling mode, as claimed.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is allowable over Lyon and Stephens. Accordingly, claims 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Lyon/Stephens/Gosior Rejection:

Claim 28 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon and Stephens, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0159434 to Gosior et al. (hereafter “Gosior”). Applicants respectfully submit that Gosior fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lyon and Stephens set forth above in connection with independent claim 8. Particularly, Gosior is relied upon by the Examiner merely to teach a polling message that includes a header and payload (see Office Action at page 10). Thus, Applicants submit that claim 28 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 8. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Lyon/Stephens/Gosior/Birk Rejection:

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon, Stephens, and Gosior, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0236975 to Birk et al. (hereafter “Birk”). Applicants submit that Birk fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lyon, Stephens, and Gosior set forth above in connection with independent claim 8. Particularly, Birk is relied upon by the Examiner merely for its teachings relating to authentication information including a security certificate (see Office Action at page 10). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 30 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8. As such, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Parks/Stephens Rejection:

Claims 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,455,466 to Parks (hereafter “Parks”) in view of Stephens. As discussed above, claim 8 now recites a coil that is controlled by the processor unit to alternate between the energized and de-energized state at regular intervals while in the polling mode. Applicants respectfully submit that Parks fails to teach or suggest this feature. Further, as discussed above, Stephens does not remedy this deficiency.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable over Parks and Stephens, and claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Parks/Stephens/Higuchi Rejection:

Claim 14 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks and Stephens, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,132 to Higuchi et al. (hereafter “Higuchi”). Applicants respectfully submit that Higuchi fails to remedy the deficiencies of Parks and Stephens set forth above in connection with independent claim 8. Particularly, Higuchi is relied upon by the Examiner merely to teach sending data to a computer system to indicate it is receiving inductive energy (see Office Action at page 6). Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 8. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 and Claims Dependent Thereon

Lyon/Gosior/Stephens/Parks Rejection:

Claims 16-19 and 21 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Gosior, Stephens, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0155892 to Poletti

(hereafter “Poletti”). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 16 now recites displaying an object on a graphical user interface in order to visually indicate that external power is being received, wherein the displayed object *visually differentiates between receiving inductive power and utility power*.

In the rejection, the Examiner relies on Poletti to teach the claimed “displaying an object,” citing Fig. 3 (reference character 22) and paragraph 0031. However, in paragraph 0031, Poletti lists the types of information that may be provided in the display 22:

“The display 22 allows to visualise data concerning the type of battery to be charged, the type of charging curve of the battery, and the parameters pertaining to the different charging steps, for example: charging current, voltage at the battery terminals, elapsed time from beginning of the charge, ampere-hours supplied and energy used by the apparatus from the beginning of the charge.”

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Poletti of displaying an object that *visually differentiates between receiving inductive and utility power*, as claimed. Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner in page 8 of the office Action, none of Lyon, Gosior, and Stephens teaches displaying an object on a graphical user interface. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest every claimed feature recited in claim 16.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 16 is in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that claims 17-19 and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Lyon/Gosior/Stephens/Poletti/Higuchi Rejection:

Claim 20 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon, Gosior, Stephens, and Poletti, and further in view of Higuchi. Applicants submit that Higuchi does not remedy the deficiencies of Lyon, Gosior, Stephens, and Poletti set forth above in connection with independent claim 16. Particularly, in this rejection, Higuchi is relied upon by the Examiner merely for its teachings relating to transmitting data to a computing unit to be used for computing the charged capacity of a battery cell (see Office Action at page 9, citing Higuchi at col. 4, lines 33-38).

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Dated: May 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

for

By Michael K. Mutter #47,305
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant